

TURKISH BARBARISM.

there are sure to be in the present case any pity one might be tempted to feel for the victim is very much nullified by the fact that the depositions in the London bank were caught with the sanction of an offer of "18 per cent." and, therefore, to some extent, victims of their own folly. The sentence is a wholesome one, and one which is hailed as an important stride in the cause of commercial morality, which just now is at a rather lowebb here. One cannot help, however, feeling the justice of the question asked by many of the papers in discussion, "How is it that so many of our financial swindles escape the grasp of the criminal law?"

My neighbor's friend on Central Asia, and that of Captain Burnaby—the intrepid Life Guardsman who crossed the Khyber Desert—on the same subject, are to appear in October. My neighbor's friend is writing, I believe, the scene of which will be partly laid in the United States and the heroine of which will be a Southern girl. A novel from Heworth Dixon's pen will be looked for with a good deal of curiosity, and by those who best know and most admire his literary gifts, with some anxiety.

PARLIAMENT PROLOGUED.

TENOR OF THE ROYAL MESSAGE—MUCH LEGISLATION DURING THE LAST DAYS OF THE SESSION—IMPORTANT SPEECH OF SIR CHARLES DILKE—UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO SWIM THE CHANNEL—[FROM AN OCCASIONAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

LONDON, AUG. 17.—A session, in many respects remarkable, in some respects even unique, is that which was formally closed on Tuesday by the reading of what purported to be a message from the Queen in the presence of about 50 members of both Houses assembled for the purpose in the House of Lords. It had a brilliant beginning, so far as exterior pageantry and promises go, and in one respect it has had a conspicuous ending, inasmuch as it has seen the absorption of Benjamin Disraeli, the Earl of Beaconsfield, and the more than probable ending of a brilliant career. So far as the session, however, is concerned, it might as well have been over a fortnight ago, for since the early struggles on the Education bill there have been none but official members present, and the business of the country had been conducted by less than a score of persons. Had any one been so mischievously disposed, he might have put a summary end to the session by moving a count of the House every time it met or was supposed to meet. And yet in its dying hours more real work was got through than had been accomplished—the voting of money apart—in all the previous part of the session. All the business affecting domestic politics, all the new acts bearing upon the internal affairs of the country, which were brought in by the Government, have been passed since Whit Sunday, and more than half of those for which the Ministry takes credit in the Royal message in the last four or five weeks. Her Majesty is made to say: "I regret that the pressure of other business has prevented the completion of your labors upon several measures of much importance," and the catalogue of these is an ominous look. But there was one paragraph in the Royal message that many readers will hope, which unhappily has not been realized—and that was one referring to the disturbances in the Turkish Empire. The words "Should a favorable opportunity present itself, I shall be ready, in concert with any allies, to offer my good offices for the purpose of mediation between the contending parties," were heralded not merely as an empty, meaningless phrase, but as an indication that something had been done or was about to be done "for the purpose of mediation between the contending parties." The spirit in which these negotiations were undertaken depends entirely upon to what for the moment had the supremacy in the Cabinet—Lord Derby or Mr. Disraeli. As they appear to have failed, it was most likely the latter. It would be interesting, really to know how far the rumor is true that Mr. Disraeli, when he goes up to the Peers, intends to pay greater attention to foreign affairs. And how far, if it is, it means an elbowing out of Lord Derby. If the Royal message possesses any interest at all, it is in these portions which have reference to foreign affairs, and more especially those which have reference to the East. But whatever the retrospect, or whatever the prospect, the session is over; London is once more busy—as or as empty as it ever is—and both ministers and legislators have joined the crowds of holiday-makers on the moors, the continent, or in crossing the Atlantic.

The first speech of the recess was one delivered, before the recess was four hours old, by Sir Charles Dilke, and for more reasons than one this has attracted, even at this moment, when every one is sick of the very name of politics, a great deal of attention. Sir Charles Dilke is very rapidly gaining ground both in and out of Parliament, but he is just now the center of attraction from another cause. He is one of the leaders—or at all events he is credited with being one—of a movement among the Radicals who sit below the gangway for more combined and effective action to secure a hearing for their views. Some have gone so far as to designate it as a new or independent party. The existence of a new independent party has been denied, and the desire to act in any way contrary to the wishes or interests of the official portion of the Liberal party is repudiated. Be this as it may, the extreme wing of the party have of late set an example in the direction of combined action which might be followed with great advantage by those higher in authority in the councils of the Liberal party. Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Cowan, and Mr. Chamberlain, the newly-elected member for Birmingham, are among those who are described as leaders of this new or advanced party, and accordingly Sir Charles Dilke has been the center of attraction that has come in for more attention. I need not say that his remarks were pungent and caustic, that they were epigrammatic and witty, and that the Government were thereby very freely exposed.

A large portion of the speech was, of course, devoted to affairs in the East, and this portion especially. Sir Charles Dilke has been very ready to throw aside all prejudices on this question. He strikes out a new path for a radical politician, and one which is thoroughly original and characteristic of him. He has been very ready to resort to the aid of the struggles now going on in Turkey, and he sees emphatically two sides to the question. Even in regard to the Bulgarian atrocities, though unappearing in his denunciations of the Turks, he is equally ready to sympathize to the other side. While calling themselves Christians, the Servians neglected their first duties of a Christian, and declined to tolerate any form of religious freedom. He says that the Roman Catholics preferred the Turks to the Servians. Though, on the whole, the English Liberal opinion has been very friendly to the Turks, Sir Charles spoke of the barbarism of the Montenegrins and the intolerance and corruption of the Servians in a manner which brought the House of Commons to its feet. He was talking of a Moslem slave, and he sees emphatically two sides to the question. Sir Charles was equally liberal and broad. He devoted much attention to the question of Russia, and he was up in his place. To aid the present movement was to play into the hands of Russia, who, in his opinion, had got up the insurrection in Bosnia, and that it was necessary to do so, he suggested the aid of Russia upon Turkey by Servia. He has a very poor opinion of Ignatieff, whom he calls an unscrupulous agent. Lord Derby makes a large share of Sir Charles Dilke's disparaging remarks. He says that the Government have nearly all the questions of external policy of the year he had blundered—among them the extradition question. The speech occupies three columns of *The Times*, and the editorially noted it.

Another attempt to swim across the English Channel has ended in failure, and very nearly in the death of the venture. It is just twenty-four hours since a man named Cavill, who had been possible for a man under certain conditions to accomplish the feat, but that it was more than probable that any one else would not succeed, even though they would be here, and an vigorous in the water, would be here. The man who entered the water off Dover Pier at midnight on Monday, and who was taken out quite unconscious, and as nearly as possible dead, just two hours after, was named Cavill, who was estimated at from four to six. Cavill had already shown himself a good long-distance swimmer, he having swum from London Bridge to Portsmouth, and from Southampton to Portsmouth. A few weeks ago he made the distance from Dover Pier to within half a mile of Ramsgate Harbor, and yet he has failed to cross the Channel. He will not be able to do so, for he is not well, but he is not, for he is clearly not equal to the task.

SOCIAL STRUGGLES.

of the great Revolution of 1789-93 should, at the end of little more than half a century (namely, little more than two generations) degenerate into a priest-ridden, miracle-believing community, rebellious to every form of Liberalism. The explanation, as I have tried to establish, is a double one—firstly, the "communism" has not all been really deteriorated, as it might seem from the retrograde majorities of the last four years; and it is only the apparent (or so-called governing) classes that have submitted to the infection; and secondly, these apparent portions of the community are so much more numerous than they were sixty, fifty, or even twenty years ago, that they not only seem to represent the majority of the nation, but when you resolutely set them on one side, you must be prepared to accept in their stead the enormous anonymous mass of men who have no "stake in the country," as it is termed, and who in no Old World European country have as yet ever constituted the "governing classes."

The Jesuits, having to dispose of the consecrating power in French society at the present time, have, through their vanity, corrupted the hitherto liberal and intelligent *bourgeois* class wholesale—so that there is no solid substratum on which to rest for resistance to the frivolities and fatal narrowness of the old aristocratic element. You must go down at once to what old countries may be excused for calling the "Unknown."

This is really what has been achieved by the late elections, and the Assembly does count such a ponderant mass of relatively young and thoroughly obscure members that one can understand the amazement, if not the terror, of the timid Conservatives. M. Thiers amuses himself by saying to his friends with a sly smile: "*ils sont très-gravité, ces petits jeunes gens—d'accès de différence pour moi*," they are as nice as possible, these young fellows—and full of deference for me!

But France is being practically governed by the new *couches sociales*, and you see now some of the reasons for the clerical and social reaction against them.

SUMMER IN ROME.

LETTER FROM T. ADOLPHUS TROLLOPE.

THE ITALIAN SENATE SITTING STILL TO WAIT ACTION OF THE LOWER HOUSE—SECRET VOTING AND ITS EVILS—PEOPLE LEAVING THE CITY FOR COUNTRY LIFE—SNOBISHNESS OF WOULD-BE FASHIONABLE PERSONS.

[FROM A REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

ROME, AUG. 5.—IT is rather hard upon our Senators that they should be compelled to continue their sittings in the dog-days because the lower branch of the Legislature will not, as it easily might, dispatch the business which will need to be subsequently submitted to the Senate at an earlier date. This year the doctrine that *noblesse oblige* has been brought home to their worship by very considerable force of conviction. The most interesting topic, however, to which their protracted sittings have given rise has been due, not to the Senatorial wisdom with which their discussions have illustrated any of the matters brought before them, but simply to a strange and unexplained error which occurred in the voting of the law respecting the *panti franchi*, an arrangement proposed by the Government for the purpose of providing commerce with the facilities which it enjoys in England under the system of bonded warehouses. The system is not altogether analogous to the English one, and the opponents of the measure, who had been supporters of Signor Minghetti's late Government, had little difficulty in showing that it was open to very serious objections which do not apply to the English bonded warehouses, especially the absence of governmental control, and consequently of knowledge on the part of the Government of the amount of goods which enter. More interesting than the discussion upon this point, however, was the accident (if accident it were) which took place at the voting. The votes were equal, and it thus became competent for the President to give his casting vote in favor of the measure. But the number of balls in the urn was not equal to that of the Senators present! What was to be thought of this? And, above all, what was to be done? Was the votation to be considered void, or not? Eventually it was decided that it must be so considered. But the controversy to which the incident gave rise is still going on, and has brought to the front some considerations of a more important nature than any result of the discussion on the *panti franchi* can be. The reader is probably aware that in the Italian Parliament all voting of particular clauses of a bill, or of amendments proposed in the course of discussion, is done openly, either by sitting or rising, or by roll-call, with rising as answer of "Yes" or "No" by each member. But for the final passing of a measure in its entirety, the law provides that the voting shall be secret. Urns are placed on a table in front of the President's chair, and each member drops a black or a white ball into the urns, without its being possible that any human being should know how he has voted.

The law appears to me to be in all respects, and from every point of view, an unfortunate one; and circumstances have recently arisen that have had the effect of leading many of the more thoughtful of the public men in Italy to the same opinion. It is not long since a very important measure—that of the late Prime Minister, for enacting the nullity of legal deeds which had not been stamped at the time of execution—was voted piecemeal, a majority of the Chamber voting openly for every one of the clauses of it. But when the bill was to be voted on in its entirety—a process which, after the previous voting, ought to have been a mere formality and foregone conclusion—the secret vote of the Chamber rejected it! The explanation of the fact, in this case, was unfortunately not far to seek. The gist of the measure was to prevent the fraudulent evasion of a tax, which, as matters stood—and, thanks to that corrupt secret vote, still stand—was very largely evaded. The rejection of the measure implied the avowed preference for a system under which fraud was easy to one under which it would have become impossible, or at least extremely difficult. And honorable members did not find themselves masters of a sufficient stock of cynical audacity to make this avowal openly. But they had no difficulty in doing so under the shelter of the secret ballot. Men who had voted openly in the face of day for every portion of the measure, voted secretly against the entirety of it! Who the honorable gentlemen were who had been guilty of this tergiversation and this preference for fraud remained the inviolable secret of the voting urn. But the result has given rise to grave doubts in many minds as to the desirability of continuing the practice of secret voting. It is beginning to be felt that it robs free institutions, constitutional government, and parliamentary practice of the most valuable portion of the lesson these things are so admirably adapted to teach the Italians, who have so much need of such schooling. The practice of giving a vocal vote and secret vote is but too much in accordance with all the least satisfactory portions of the Italian character. It is calculated to foster and keep alive those very vices of character which three long centuries of despotism in Church and State have engendered. And it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the recent awkward accident in the Senate has been due to irregular practices springing out of the same faults of character. The case is not so bad a one; for the question to be decided was one fairly open to difference of opinion, and there had been no such previous decision by open voting as that which made the case in the Chamber, which has been alluded to, so peculiarly disgraceful. Nevertheless, the system of secret voting has received another damaging blow.

The definitive placing of the Italian capital at Rome has, among a host of more important consequences, had the odd result of transplanting a fashionable folly from the banks of the Thames to those of the Tiber. The joke among snobish, would-be fashionable folks in London, who, not being able to accomplish an Autumnal emigration from town like their betters, put up the shutters of the windows toward the street, and condemn themselves to live in back rooms or in darkness, in order that they may be supposed to be out of town, is an old one. And now we are beginning to have the same thing at Rome! I suppose that to a certain

SUMMER LEISURE

[illegible]